

REMARKS

Drawings

Amended drawings are filed herewith.

Claim Objections

The amendments to claims 8 and 9 resolve the antecedent basis and description of objections raised in the office action. The antecedent basis of “the luminous plate (1)” in line 3 of claim 10 is “a luminous plate (1)” in line 2 of claim 10. The further amendments to claim 10 obviate the objection to it in the office action.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicant respectfully traverses the office action’s § 112 comments regarding claims 5 and 6 reciting the formation of an asymmetrical light/dark boundary. The majority of the specification clearly explains how the inventor achieved this advantageous effect by preconfigured control of the space between the edge of the light emitting chip (4) and the various edges of the recess in which the chips are mounted. These features are structurally recited in the independent claim 1. They are described in more than adequate detail in paragraphs 18 (describing Figures 2 and 3), 23 (describing Figures 4a and 4b), 26 and 27 (describing Figures 5 and 6), and 29 (describing Figures 7 and 8). These structural assemblies generating an asymmetric light/dark boundary as claimed is more than adequately explained to one of ordinary skill in the applicant’s art. The person of ordinary skill is clearly enabled and put in possession of the ability to control light/dark boundaries and luminosity gradients by controlling the structure as

explained and to appreciate that the effect of such control is described as stated in paragraph 22 (Figure 1b), paragraph 25 (Figure 4b), paragraphs 27 and 28 (Figure 6) and paragraph 30 (Figures 7 and 8). Paragraph 31 also explains the structure and its result as well as how to change the structure in order to create a preconfigured change in the resulting asymmetric light/dark boundary.

The claims recite precisely what is explained in a manner that makes it distinctly clear and particularly points out to one of ordinary skill in applicant's art the applicant's invention and consequent ownership of the structurally recited control of the space relation between light emitting chips and the edge of a luminous panel in which they are mounted in order to achieve the structurally recited asymmetric light/dark boundary. No one of ordinary skill in this art would have trouble understanding the asymmetric structural relations recited or the asymmetric light/dark boundary created by the structure recited. Accordingly, the claims comply with the § 112(2) requirement that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim that which infringes to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The same is true of claim 5's recitation of a "break". The exact shape and location of the "break", or bend or angle in the recess edge labeled 32' is clearly identified. It is labeled 33. No one of ordinary skill in the relevant art would fail to understand the structure corresponding to the claim recitation of a "break". The rejection is based on § 112(2). The recited structure in the claim further points out and distinctly claims what the applicant is claiming as his invention. The application also complies with § 112(1), by both enabling those with skill in the art and demonstrating possession

of asymmetrical LDBs and their formation by breaks, as illustrated and fully set forth in the specification.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102 rejection of pending claims 1 through 4 as anticipated as Tsukamoto. The office action states that a “casing 31a” having edges anticipates the recited recess edge of the claimed luminous panel in the pending claims. Tsukamoto teaches no such thing. To begin with, even if the casing 31a is to be read as an analogous component, Tsukamoto does not teach any spaced relation between that edge and the light source wherein the edge affects a luminosity gradient or a light/dark boundary of the light passing past that edge. In fact, the edge of the casing 31a in Tsukamoto does not appear to contact the light beams emitted at all. Rather it appears that “cylindrical holders 21 – 25” have edges that extend far enough in the direction of a light beam to prevent the light beam from touching the edge of the casing. *See*, paragraph 50. In any event, the relative position of the edge of the casing 31a and the edges of the cylindrical holders 21-25 is not clear in the Tsukamoto reference. Therefore, the reference fails to embody or teach the structure recited in the pending claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Neither the Tsukamoto reference independently nor in combination with either Wang reference, suggests or motivates the structure recited in the pending claims. In fact, they teach away from it. The Tsukamoto primary reference teaches that cylindrical holders are required to direct the beams of light from the LEDs in general and in fact that

they must have lenses. Moreover the reference teaches away from control of luminous diffusion, luminous gradients or light/dark boundaries by controlling the spaced relation of LEDs and substrate recess edges as claimed. It teaches overlapping beams by angling the cylindrical holders inward, *See* paragraph 54. Nothing in the Wang references teaches anything about the structure recited in the pending claims or the results achieved by the spaced relations recited. The references, individually and in combination, failing to disclose, suggest or motivate the structure recited in the pending claims, the claims are not rendered obvious by the references or their proposed combinations.

New Claims

The new claims are supported throughout the specification and drawings.

CONCLUSION

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Robert C. Haldiman, Reg. No. 45,437
Husch & Eppenberger, LLC
190 Carondelet Plaza
St. Louis, MO 63105
314-480-1641
314-480-1505 FAX